

("Bohrman") in view of Osamu. Both of these grounds are similar, because the Examiner relies on Washino and Peters to teach combining a camera with a video recorder in a portable housing, Freeman and Bohrman to teach editing a sequence of segments and Osamu to teach that "editing functions" can be combined with a camera and video recorder in a portable housing.

In the explanation of the first ground of rejection, the Examiner admits that the combination of Washino and Freeman fails to teach that the editing means is within the housing of the recorder. The Examiner asserts that Osamu teaches that it is known to install an editing means within a housing of a video recorder.

In the explanation of the second ground of rejection, the Examiner admits that Peters fails to teach a motion camera in the housing of the recorder, but that Osamu teaches having a camera combined with a recorder. But the Examiner admits that Osamu fails to teach that editing specifies a sequence of segments of the stored motion video information.

Washino teaches recording of digital video information, as does Peters. Both Peters and Washino discuss how the recorded information may be provided to an editing system.

Freeman and Bohrman both teach editing systems, and Bohrman in particular teaches editing a sequence of segments of motion video information.

Osamu is the only reference relied by the Examiner as teaching an editing system that is within the housing of a recorder, but the Examiner admits that Osamu fails to teach that editing specifies a sequence of segments of the stored motion video information. In fact, Osamu only teaches that control buttons 106-120 are used to switch modes, change shutter speed, fade in, fade out and create digital titles.

The Examiner, in response to the Applicant's prior reply, has argued that "incorporating an editing means in a recorder integrated with a camera is well known in the art at the time the invention was made," referencing Osamu.

Osamu only teaches that a *specific* kind of "editing" (particularly switching modes, changing shutter speed, fading in, fading out and creating digital titles) may be incorporated into a camera. The Examiner argues that Osamu therefore *generally* suggests that *all* kinds of "editing" may be incorporated into a camera. The Examiner then argues that because Bohrman and Freeman both teach a kind of "editing" (in this case, creating a sequence of segments), in view of Osamu, one of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Bohrman and Freeman with those of Peters and Washino.

The Examiner's argument does not support a conclusion of obviousness because Osamu does *not generally* teach that all kinds of "editing" can be incorporated into a camera. Osamu only teaches a *specific* set of functions (particularly switching modes, changing shutter speed, fading in, fading out and creating digital titles) that are notably dissimilar from "specifying a sequence of segments" of stored "motion video information" as claimed in all of the independent claims. Because Osamu does *not* suggest combining teachings of Freeman or Bohrman in a housing of a video recorder, the rejections (on both grounds) of all of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103 are traversed.

Other Art


The Examiner also refers to Bluth and Silverbrook as teaching digital cameras with editing functions. In Bluth, the camera 11 has outputs that may be selected by a camera control 12 to be output for editing purposes. Editing functions are not in the camera. Thus Bluth does not teach "specifying a sequence of segments" of stored "motion video information". In Silverbrook, live video may be transitioned to stored animation, or stored animation may be transitioned to live video, while the live video is being recorded onto a tape. Silverbrook does not teach "specifying a sequence of segments" of stored "motion video information".

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this reply, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0876.

Respectfully submitted,
McKain et al.

By: 
Peter J. Gordon, Reg. No. 35,164
Avid Technology, Inc.
One Park West
Avid Technology Park
Tewksbury, Massachusetts 01876
Tel. No.: 978.640.3011
Attorney for Applicant

Date: July 18, 2002
Docket Number: A1995001C2